
ABEUNT STUDIA IN MORES
APR. 13
18 92
THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY

The Open Court.

A

WEEKLY MAGAZINE

DEVOTED TO THE WORK OF

CONCILIATING RELIGION WITH SCIENCE.

VOLUME V.

CHICAGO:
THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY.
1891.

GENERAL INDEX.

VOLUME V.

ESSAYS AND CONTRIBUTIONS.

ESSAYS AND CONTRIBUTIONS—Continued.

EDITORIALS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

POETRY.

BOOK REVIEWS, NOTES, ETC.

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 183. (Vol. V.—1.) CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 26, 1891. { Two Dollars per Year. Single Copies, 5 Cts.

MONEY AND ITS FUNCTIONS.

BY LYMAN J. GAGE.

Being requested to present a popular explanation of money and its functions, I shall endeavor to avoid all technical terms and speak in the simplest manner possible. We are all deeply interested in getting a practical comprehension of what money is in its essential nature. Let us study it in the past, for the past can in all things teach us knowledge.

It is perfectly clear that, through all time, since man produced anything by his skill or industry, he has been in the habit of exchanging that portion of his labor which he did not need for his own use, for some portions more or less great of such things as other men by their skill or industry were able to produce beyond their own needs, but differing in kind from his own. These products were originally directly exchanged for each other. But it came about in the evolution of ideas, manners, and customs of all people sufficiently advanced to be called civilised or semi-civilised, that some one product of human skill or industry possessed a quicker and more universal exchangeability than any other. For it in certain quantities all men became willing to exchange whatever they had to exchange, whether the product of their labor or their labor service.

At different periods and among different people, this one peculiar thing was not constantly and everywhere the same. At one time or place it has been a beaver skin; at another time or place, shells or beads; at another, cattle or slaves; at another, iron, copper, or brass; at another, silver or gold. Now, by reason of this peculiar and universal exchangeability, the price or exchangeable power of all other commodities came to be expressed by the quantity of this one peculiar commodity for which they could be exchanged. It was natural that a name should be attached to the peculiar thing, and that name was money.

The books will give all the reasons which led to the natural selection of these various things designated as money. I shall content myself with one or two. First, and fundamentally, they were such things in their respective times and places as would universally minister to the comfort or pleasure of those who possessed them. Second, they were in their respective times and places relatively the most convenient, not only for the purposes of universal exchange, but for preservation against further needs. It has been by the free play of human choice, ending in a consensus of action, that money has been thus evolved, never by conventional agreements made in advance.

In modern times, among civilised nations, silver and gold have superseded all other commodities as money, but they do not differ in their essential characteristics of desirableness in themselves (either for utility or ornament) from those other commodities which in ruder times, among more primitive people, were equally entitled to the appellation money.

It does not need a moment's thought to satisfy us that it was by a true *survival of the fittest* that gold and silver finally obtained universal recognition as money, and superseded all other forms of it.

Bear skins were universally desired, both for comfort and ornament, but too long kept they were liable to moth and mildew, and their value was thus diminished or destroyed. Cattle were liable to disease and death, and were expensive to care for. Finally, copper, iron, and brass were too easily produced and united in themselves the disadvantages of bulk as well as weight, with small value. Silver and gold are not easily destroyed. They are almost infinitely divisible, their purity or fineness is readily determined. As society has developed, their desirability for use and ornament has not diminished. Since they are practically indestructible, easily hidden and guarded, they of all things are the most convenient for their possessor to keep for such future needs of exchange for other things as he may then desire.

With this general statement thus made, I will ask and answer a few questions, which will lead by the shortest route to the end of my subject.

Question. Would not some other thing than silver or gold have been just as useful, just as exchangeable, and just as much entitled to the name of money, if these had not been selected?

Answer. Yes, perhaps so. But it is sufficient that these two *Society* has adopted, and in such a matter the individual may well go with the crowd.

Q. Ought there not to be more money in circulation? Is there now enough for the wants of trade?

A. The question cannot be answered by either an absolute Yes or No.

In the beginning,—if in such a matter there could be a definite point of beginning,—the quantity would have been of no consequence, or, in the words of Bonamy Price, "Any would have been enough, because the price of things would have become related to the volume of money, whether that volume were great or small; and once established in their fair relation to each other through their common relation to money, it would make no difference whether their price was what we would now call high or low. But the truly ideal money would increase in a ratio commensurate to the increase of things to be exchanged, minus the quickness of exchange which time might bring.

It is not probable that either gold or silver, or both in use together as the bimetalists desire, would form the ideal money. In this sublunary sphere, the ideal is seldom reached.

I am not aware of any well-ascertained data by which the question, Is there money enough? can be definitely answered. There has been an increase in volume within the last fifteen years much greater in ratio than the ratio of increase in the volume of things to be exchanged. There are those who affirm that there is not half enough. My own opinion is, that there is enough; that the price of things has become related to the existing stock, and that with the economics that have been secured and will no doubt be further gained in the use of money, there need be no present fear of a proper supply. A reasonable amount of good money is better than a larger supply of an inferior kind, since either have to be bought and paid for by honest labor.

Q. Would silver and gold be now rightly entitled to the name of money, if they were not coined at the mint and the value of the coin determined by *law?*

A. Yes. They would exchange as freely as now, and would then as now, be entitled in every sense but a technical legal sense, to the name of money. The coinage does not give the metal any value that the metal did not before possess. The law determines the fineness and quantity which a given coin shall contain; gives a name to the various coins respectively, and therefore treats of them as money, not recognising in its phraseology gold and silver in the form of bullion as money. But as bullion is as readily exchanged, and (in international trade) more to be desired than coin, and as the value of the coin derives its power from the quantity and fineness of the metal it contains, and not from the stamp of the Government machine, I repeat that essentially gold and silver bullion are as much entitled to the name of money before being coined into dollars, or sovereigns, or francs, as afterward.

I know that here is a vital point of dispute; that because the law in speaking of money treats only of what it has stamped as such, philosophers are able to confuse us very much by attributing to the stamp the money value which really lies under it.

The law recognises, gives sanction, or forbids, but it is powerless to create.

Q. Does not the legal-tender sanction which the law places upon the issues of its mint, give a new and original value to such legal tender coin?

A. No. The laws of legal tender give a standing interpretation to the language of a contract, where such words as dollars, pounds, francs are used, and thus notifies both parties to a contract in advance, of what the law will require if they fall into dispute.

Q. Must it then be denied that, under no condition, nor within any limits, the legal-tender quality conferred upon a thing gives that thing a value which it would not otherwise have?

A. No. I admit, for argument's sake at least, that if the government should decree that doughnuts shall be legal tender for debts, a doughnut for a dollar, then (if doughnuts did not become too plentiful) they would be largely enhanced in value while they were in demand to satisfy existing contracts or pay existing debts, but I do say that as under such conditions all existing contracts would be soon cancelled and no new ones created, except upon the basis of the natural exchangeable value of doughnuts, they would soon cease to be in demand, and possessing in themselves only the value of doughnuts, they would sink back to their natural doughnut value. But the operation sketched ought not to be recognised as a creation of value, even of a temporary kind. It is really a robbing under the guise of law. Governments can confiscate and destroy—they cannot create value.

Q. How, then, is it that 412½ grains of silver, coined into a silver dollar, will exchange in the market for $25\frac{8}{10}$ grains of gold, while as bullion, the same quantity of silver will only exchange for about two-thirds of as much gold?

A. There is one simple answer which completely explains the disparity. Great ingenuity is displayed in making some other explanation—scientific perhaps, but hard to comprehend. The one I submit is simple; any one can understand it, viz.:

For some years past and at the present time, the United States Government has been, and is, in the receipt of an income through tariff duties and excise dues, of about $1,500,000 per day. This large revenue it disburses in payment of the interest and towards the principal of its debt, for pensions, and general administration expense. Upon its debts, and to whomsoever desires, it pays gold coin on the basis of $25\frac{8}{10}$ grains to the dollar. From whomsoever desires to pay money into the treasury through the excise dues,

it will receive as of equal value gold coin or silver dollars containing 412½ grains each. Thus it practically buys that amount of coined silver, giving in consideration an exemption from the payment of $25\frac{8}{10}$ coined gold. If it would receive nickels or dimes in satisfaction of such dues in a similar way, they would become exchangeable for about a dollar in gold each, if it were certain that the government could continue thus to receive them with one hand, while with the other it continued to pay, as now, in gold. The operation is in fact a virtual exchange to the extent the community now desires, of gold coin and silver coins on the basis of their (theoretical) legal value, instead of their commercial or natural relative value. The difference some one now does, or will hereafter, pay.

Q. Cannot the government continue this forever, and thus forever preserve a higher value to the silver coin than its equivalent in silver bullion?

A. No. Because with the continued coinage of silver in the present ratio of the coinage of gold, about three to one—that is to say, fifty-four millions of silver, against say twenty millions of gold, per annum—the proportion of silver payment to the government will steadily increase, until the treasury department will be obliged to either pay in silver or buy gold in exchange for it. With free coinage of silver, this result will be the sooner reached.

Whenever the government is thus compelled to suspend its present course in the respect just pointed out, the real commercial relation between the gold and silver coin will begin to appear. Then silver coin and silver bullion (coinage being free) of the same weight and fineness, will be alike in value, the same as gold coin and gold bullion now are.

Q. Then you do not believe that the free coinage of silver as now proposed, would enhance the value of silver bullion, and restore the old relations of 16 to 1 between gold and silver?

A. Free coinage of silver would no doubt give to 412½ grains of silver bullion $\frac{9}{10}$ fine, as much value, i. e. purchasing power, as would be contained in the coined dollar; and if the government or some other power rich enough, would forever give gold for silver in the ratio of 1 to 16, then the old rates of 16 to 1 could be maintained. But we have already perceived (if it be the truth) that our government cannot do this. It may be added, that so long as the government is willing to accept silver at a fixed ratio, thus creating an artificial value for it higher than its natural value, silver will, as sure as water seeks its level, flow from all parts of this country and also from foreign countries into the United States Treasury driving out the gold, and the government will have to pay the difference. Even if the government had the financial ability to bear the loss, it would be a foolish use to make of it, since all its power is derived from the people, and is used at their cost.

The fact is, that the value of all things—that is, their exchangeable quality for other things—is determined, and ought to be determined, by the free play of human action. Efforts made by powerful bodies, governments, corporations, syndicates, or trusts, to interfere with the free action of men in these regards, is injurious to all. The statement is as true when applied to gold and silver as it is of other things. Neither gold nor silver have value different in kind or differently derived, from other things. They are good for use and ornament. They will exchange for other things; but the relation in which they will exchange for other things, never continues for any long period the same. Nor is there anything in their nature by which (under any rule that can be stated) they should, in law or morals, continue to exchange for things in a fixed ratio to each other, of 15 to 1, or 16 to 1, or any other ratio. In fact, except within nominal limits, they never have thus been practically related. In every country where the effort has been made to make a fixed ratio practically operative, that effort has finally failed.* One of the two metals has always been the real money of account, the real instrument of exchange in the great industrial movements; the other has operated in an auxiliary and subordinate capacity. Perceiving this to be the fact, Great Britain in 1816 gave up the experiment, made gold the sole money of account, and coined silver for subordinate use only.

In our own country, from 1792 to 1873 our mints were open to the free coinage of silver and gold, part of the time in the ratio of 15 to 1, and part of the time in the ratio of 16 to 1; but in the whole period of 80 years, only 8 millions in silver dollars were coined. The mints of Mexico and Japan are both open to gold, but silver being the only medium of exchange, alone goes to the mint.

The Latin Union, so-called, made a league, limiting the coinage of silver, hoping thus to preserve in practice a theoretic ratio; but they were obliged to break it, and suspend coinage of one of the metals.

If we wished to secure the free exchange of these metals in a fixed ratio, it would be necessary to make an agreement with all commercial nations of the world. No doubt the silver producing countries would gladly agree. We could well afford to. In 1850 this country produced silver to the value of $50,000. In 1890, the

*The ancient historians tell us of early times in Arabia and in Germany when silver was worth the same as gold, weight for weight. The ratio fixed by Spain in 1497 was $10\frac{3}{4}$ to 1. Then in 1546, being dominant in the world of commerce and finance, she fixed the ratio at $13\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. In the next century (1688) one hundred years after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, Portugal, then prosperous, wealthy, and dominant, fixed the governing ratio at 16 to 1. Then in 1717 England fixed hers at 15.02 to 1; France in 1726 at $14\frac{1}{2}$ to 1; Spain in 1775 at $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 in the Peninsula, though 16 remained the ratio in her American colonies. In 1785 and 1803 France adopted the Spanish ratio of $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1

annual product was about fifty millions gold value. But there is much reason to doubt that non-silver producing countries would enter into such a compact. Great Britain certainly will not.

Well, then! If it be impossible to maintain the practical use of two kinds of money like silver and gold in a fixed ratio, which of the two is it the wiser to use?

The answer must depend on circumstances. If a country is insulated from others, has no commercial relations outside its own boundaries, and desires to establish none; then it may be said that it is quite an indifferent matter which of the two shall be the recognised money. Either will do. But if a country has trade and commerce beyond its own boundaries, and desires to encourage and extend such trade, then its interests require the use of that money which is current in the market where its foreign trade is settled. At the present time that market is Great Britain.

If the United States of America is to take that position in the World's progress, which we confidently hope for, it must be by the extension of its trade and commerce with other parts of the world. Whatever favors this, favors our Nation's development. Whatever hinders this, restricts and hampers our progress. At the present time, and for an indefinite period in the future, all our foreign commerce, amounting now to fifteen hundred millions of dollars per annum, is of necessity, transacted under the English standard of gold, for London is the settling-house were all these foreign payments are made. If we ship flour to Brazil, we must take our pay in London. If we buy sugar from Cuba, we must pay in London. If in our domestic affairs we degenerate to the silver basis, as we certainly will if the present compulsory coinage of silver goes on, or if those who seek to open our mines for the free and unlimited coinage of silver shall have their way, we shall then have voluntarily surrendered the standard that puts us on a parity with other commercial nations in the struggle for the world's trade, and shall have adopted a standard, whether theoretically superior or not, which will put our foreign trade and commerce in a most disadvantageous position.

So far in these remarks, I have not made any reference to paper money, so-called. What I have now to say, can be soon stated. There is a distinct and radical difference between gold and silver money, or any commodity used as money, and paper money. There ought to be a clearer distinction in the names applied to them. Gold and silver, (not to speak of absolute forms of money,) are real money. They carry their exchangeable value in themselves. Paper money derives all its power from its relation to real money. It has no value in itself, can serve no purpose either of use or ornament. Paper money is a promise, an order, a warrant, which entitles the holder to real money when asked for by him. Thus related and kept effective, paper money is an immense economy. By its use, a considerable portion of an otherwise larger stock of real money can be exchanged, for things which directly minister to human needs.

I might speak also of checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and promissory notes, which in modern times operate in the exchange of commodities. They might be called, one or two degrees removed, a kind of paper money. They perform in a limited way, the same functions that paper money performs in a larger way; and like paper money, they economise the use of real money. Economise it as they may however, they connot wholly supersede it—certainly not in this or in any immediately following generation.

A CHAPTER ON ANTHROPOPHAGY.

BY RICHARD ANDREE.

[CONCLUDED.]

As the most essential motives to anthropophagy must always be placed superstition—be it a religious or a secular sort—and revenge. These two we find spread everywhere and in fact strikingly so where cannibalism exists. Wherever prisoners of war are regarded as booty we find the handsomest and bravest and those prominent through their position eaten first. Cannibalism limits itself to the eating of separate parts; thus it is the eyes, the heart, the brain which are preferred, because they are the seat of the virtues, the bravery and the strength of the one to be consumed; and these the conqueror wishes to make his own. Thus also is explained the fact that often anthropophagy is a special right exercised by chiefs or chosen warriors, who alone are said to partake of the favor so as to strengthen and increase their moral qualities by such means. This happens sometimes in a sublime way, so to speak, among peoples who have perhaps no direct enjoyment of human flesh but who still wish to acquire from it the supposed moral gain. Thus the South American Tarianas and Tucanos do not directly eat the flesh of the dead in order to acquire the qualities and virtues of the deceased, but lay the body first for a month in the earth. Then they dig up the corpse from the earth and dry it to a crisp mass over a fire. This mass is pulverized, mixed with caxĭri and drunken.* When the fetichman of the Ashantees devours the heart of a captured enemy, he does it in order not to be tormented by the spirit of the dead of which he assumes that the seat is in the heart. The Lamas on the Amazon River eat the marrow of the bones of their dead because they imagine that thereby the souls of the dead enter their own bodies (Marcoy). The Dajaks according to Müller† give boys the scalp

*Wallace, *Amazon and Rio Negro*, London, 1853, 498.
†*Allgemeine Ethnographie*, 315.

and the heart of fallen enemies to eat in order to make them brave and spirited. A Chippeway Indian woman for the same reason fed her children on the flesh of an Englishman (Long). Among the South Australians an older brother thought to acquire the physical strength of his younger brother if he ate him (Stanbridge); in Queensland the mother devours her newborn babe under the impression that she will get back the strength drawn from her by her offspring (Angas), and she also believes that she honors the dead by eating them. The Maoris ,according to Cook, fancy that enemies who are eaten enter into eternal fire.

Everywhere we see therefore how the belief in the existence of a soul, a special spiritual power in the person to be eaten, is to be regarded as the final cause of anthropophagy. The spirit and the virtues of the person eaten are thought by the enjoyment of human flesh to enter into the possession of the person eating, exactly as by the reception of other food increase in physical strength arises.*

Closely connected with superstition is the other motive, revenge. This is most clearly and significantly shown us in the case of the Mesayas on the River Amazon, who after choking down with reluctance the flesh of slaughtered enemies vomit it up again (Marcoy). The punishment is then completed, revenge is sufficiently satisfied and the use of human flesh in and for itself appears disgusting to the Mesayas. Wild revenge was also the cause of anthropophagy among the Caribs, and the most of them were sick after the use of it (Du Tertre). Among the Botokudos revenge acts in conjunction with hunger in leading them to eat enemies (Tschudi); and Pigafetta, Vespucci, and Hans Staden relate the same of the Tupi tribes on the east coast of South America. Here, as we know from Hans Staden, passion runs so far that the destroyer of a slain enemy takes his name in order thus, besides destroying the body, to utterly obliterate his spiritual immortality. In a measure revenge is also the motive among the Negroes of the Delta of the Nile (according to Crowther); this appears to be the sole motive among the Manjnema in Central Africa (according to Livingstone). Revenge debased the Melanesians of the Solomon Islands and New Hebrides to cannibalism. It is the principal ground for anthropophagy among the Indians of America.

Revenge has been formally brought into a system among a few peoples who regarded the eating of human beings as an integral part of their legislation. The greatest punishment that can be meted out to an enemy or a transgressor consists in his being eaten. As a special example of this may be adduced, according to the accounts of Junghuhn, the Batuas in Sumatra; besides the accounts referred to we may further state that some other tribes regard anthropophagy from the same point of view; as for instance, the Kissama in West Africa according to Hamilton, and the New Caledonians according to Garnier.

Anthropophagy seems to us to be most abhorrent in those places where every feeling is so deadened that the flesh of men is a pure delicacy or where it is eaten as commonly as any other kind of flesh. When—as different credible observers agree in relating—the Fans on the Gaboon and the Obotschi on the Niger exhume and devour the corpses of strangers, we can find for this practice no palliation. Human flesh is then a ware just as among us other flesh is in the meat markets. Hutchinson saw it offered for sale in the markets on the Altkalabar in Körbea; A. Vespucci and Pigafetta describe how it is preserved by smoking among the Tupi tribes; Monbottu, Abanga and Nyam-Nyam, New Caledonians and Fiji Islanders are also to be ranked in this category of arch-cannibals; they may always have had some other motive for their practice. Even more terrible, however, appears to us the eating of one's own children, as among the New Caledonians according to Garnier, among the Nyam-Nyam according to Schweinfurth, the Australians according to Angas, Stanbridge, and others. With this practice must not be confused the otherwise frequent practice of child-murder.

It is still to be mentioned that among several peoples anthropophagy appears as the special right of certain classes. Among the Potawatomis, according to Keating, it was the privilege of a narrow brotherhood who seemed to be endowed with special heroic virtues; among the Solomon Islanders the chief received as his regular portion a part of the body wrapped up in a banana leaf; among the Tahiti an eye of the victim was presented to the king, who acted as if he would devour it, and the same is related of the Hawaiian Islanders. The last two cases are still to be seen as a survival of a once prevailing cannibalism which existed generally though in a rudimentary form in Dahomey, where the king dips his finger in the blood of the slain victim and licks it; in Ashantee where fetichmen still eat the hearts; in the Samoa and Tonga Islands and wherever in the absence of other reports we are obliged to assume the former existence of cannibalism.

Many peoples shamelessly and freely show their anthropophagy, while in others there is no lack of indications that they are ashamed of the practice. This latter case, it will seem to us, is the beginning

* In parallel with this stands the belief widely spread among uncultured peoples that special animals or plants impart by their consumption special properties. I could adduce dozens of examples, but I mention only the Zaparos on the Napo in South America who eat, through preference, fish, monkeys, and birds "in order to become quick and agile." They avoid, however, the flesh of clumsy animals like the tapir and peccari "that they may not become unwieldly like these." For that would be disastrous to a hunting people of the primeval forests. *Journal Anthropol. Institut*, vol. 11, 503.

of giving up the terrible custom. The cannibal feasts are often held in secret, and Livingstone could under no condition obtain admission to such a banquet of the Manjnema. Grifeon du Bellay states that the Fans held their feasts of human flesh in secret and excluded the children from them. This latter was the case among the Markesans; here, however, as was more generally the custom, the women were likewise excluded from taking part in the matter. The Maoris admitted only prominent women.

It is pleasing now to see how anthropophagy is more and more losing ground, and how even in the short space of historical time which has passed since the great periods of discovery cannibalism has disappeared throughout a very considerable space. It has not always been the influence of white settlers or the zeal of missionaries that has brought about the extinction of the evil; tribes have succeeded in giving up their cannibalistic customs by themselves without foreign interference. Among many Polynesians—where traces may to-day be found of the former existence of anthropophagy—it had disappeared or was on the wane when white men first entered their islands as in Tahiti, Hawaii, the Navigator Islands and in Micronesia. Without doubt the inhabitants of the Malayan Archipelago were once commonly anthropophagous; to-day it is only with difficulty that we can find there traces of this primitive custom or remains of it. Indeed in many places anthropophagy has died out with the people themselves. For instance where only a hundred years ago in the region of the great North American lakes anthropophagous redskins devoted themselves to the chase, bound their enemies to the war pole, dismembered and ate them, the English race has spread overflowing the land. On the plateaus of Anahuac where once to the world-soul bloody human sacrifice together with cannibalistic banqueting were offered, the same Indian people live to-day having given up with their language, their old customs and anthropophagy, and been brought within the pale of our civilization. It is strange that there have not been wanting defenders of anthropophagy. Zeno, Diogenes, Chrysippus, and Montaigne exculpated it on moral grounds.* George Forster believes a favorable word should be said for it. "However repulsive it may be to our education," says he, "it is still in and of itself neither unnatural nor criminal to eat human flesh. Only for this reason is it to be banned and barred: because the social feelings of human love and sympathy can thus so easily be lost. But since without these feelings no human society can exist, the first step in culture among all peoples must have been this: to abolish the eating of human beings, to excite a detestation for it."†

* Winwood Reade. *Savage Africa*, 158.

† *Sämmtliche Schriften*. Leipsic, 1843. 1. 407.

CURRENT TOPICS.

A VERY interesting journal is *The New Nation* which Mr. Edward Bellamy has just launched upon the turbulent sea of American debate. If continued on the plan of the first number *The New Nation* will be a valuable addition to the educational forces of the country. It is enthusiastic, sympathetic, and full of useful information. It is rather sectarian in tone, having its own "ism" and creed, but perhaps none the worse on that account, for isms and creeds are spiritual stimulants that sometimes tear up conservative mountains and fling them into the sea. Mr. Bellamy with fervid rhetoric describes the coming state, when all the people, having no longer any use for liberty, shall become absorbed into that beatific Nirvana known as "Government." That seems to be his dream of a new nation. He justly censures the animalism and greed of our present social system, but he does not seem to know how much of its unnatural selfishness is due to the patronage and paternalism of "government." These more than any other causes are helping to divide our people into beasts of burthen and beasts of prey. Does he ever think how many of the monopolies he complains of are created and fed by "government"? There may be too little Nationalism in some places, but certainly there is too much of it in others.

* * *

The contraction of liberty and the expansion of nationalism are clearly shown in the ten thousand bills introduced this winter into our state legislatures, to say nothing of the laws enacted or proposed by congress. To "have a law passed" appears to be the ambition of every man, and of every interest, from the millionaire ship owner, or mill owner, or mine owner, to the hod carrier and the shoveler. Men are no longer supposed to be of age at twenty-one, nor even at forty one. In the very pride of their strength and manhood they are placed under the guardianship of "government." Government must make their contracts for them, feed them with a spoon, and attend to all their business. In California, for instance, hundreds of bills have been introduced of which the following are specimens worthy of careful study: one, making the employment of persons not American citizens by contractors or sub-contractors a misdemeanor; another, making it unlawful to offer less than two dollars per day to unskilled laborers hired to work for the municipalities or the State; another, requiring that employers shall give three hours on election day to all their employés; and another, to establish a trout hatchery near San Francisco. The superstition is becoming general among us that "Government" lives up in the sky, that it has accumulated stores of impossible blessings to shower down upon its favorites, and that it has a guardian angel in the shape of a policeman to protect and care for every citizen. Independence is becoming a burthen to us, so we pray for masters to take us into their keeping, put our wills into harness, and guide our feeble minds.

* * *

The tendency of this Nationalistic legislation is made clearer to us by the actual bills themselves than by any quantity of abstract moralizing on their character, the general inclination being to surrender thought, will, and action into the keeping of our grandmother the government. In Pennsylvania is a bill to enable barber shops to keep open on Sunday, and in South Dakota is a bill to compel barber shops to remain closed on Sunday, a matter which it seems might properly be left by Dakota and Pennsylvania to the laws of health and cleanliness, without interfering with the liberty of barbers. In Illinois is a bill to pay a bounty of one cent a pound on all the sugar made in the State from sorghum, beet, or maple, while Nebraska has a bill to repeal that bounty. In Wisconsin is a bill compelling the payment of employés weekly, in Missouri a bill to compel mine owners to pay their employés every ten days, and in New Jersey a bill requiring hired persons to be paid fortnightly, with a Saturday half holiday

thrown in, our kind and meddlesome old grandmother the State assuming that the citizens are not yet of age, and therefore not capable of making contracts for themselves. In Indiana is a bill to prevent the playing of base ball on Sunday, and another compelling managers of State institutions to purchase *native* live stock for consumption; and in Dakota is a similar bill to encourage the use of *native* coal in state institutions. In Illinois is a bill allowing three cents to every inhabitant who kills an English sparrow, and in Indiana a bill giving a bounty of one cent for the scalp of that pugnacious bird, the consequence of which discrimination will be that the Indiana sparrow killer will send his birds over into Illinois where the bounty will be three cents per scalp.

* * *

The multiplication of statutory crimes is a disagreeable feature of the new nation we are so industriously building up; felonies without any moral evil, and misdemeanors innocent of injury, the free efforts of men to promote their own individual happiness. For example, in New York, besides the laws against voting too much, there are bills to punish men for voting too little, the penalty for declining to vote being fixed in the proposed bill at twenty five dollars. In Kansas it is proposed to "have a law passed" making it a felony to act as a lobbyist, or to employ an agent to secure the passage of any measure; and a bill is now before the legislature creating this new felony. In Missouri are bills making it a misdemeanor to sell tobacco in any form to minors, or to employ a locomotive engineer who has not had three years experience, or for any physician to compound prescriptions unless he is registered as a pharmacist. So also in Minnesota it will be a misdemeanor for any "incompetent person" to engage in plumbing, or dentistry, or in the business of a veterinary surgeon. A glance at the bills introduced this winter into our state legislatures will show an attempt to create five thousand new crimes, very few of them being *mala in se*. This multiplication of offenses means the multiplication of policemen, detectives, courts, and prisons. If only a tenth of those bills should become laws, judicial oppression and police tyranny would be increased to an intolerable degree; and espionage would become prime minister of the law.

* * *

While the new nation carries punishment in one hand, it bestows patronage with the other. It repeals our promises, modifies our agreements, and insures us against bad luck. In Nebraska is a bill forbidding any person to acquire over three hundred and twenty acres of land. In Illinois is a bill requiring all butter and cheese made from oleomargerine or cotton seed oil to be colored pink. In North Dakota is a bill to indemnify farmers losing crops by hail. In Minnesota is a bill exempting all manufacturing establishments from taxation, and another for distributing seed grain to farmers whose crops were destroyed by hail, storm, or blight. This is accompanied by a bill repealing the bounty for killing wolves. It has been discovered that this bounty, three dollars a scalp in certain months, and five dollars a scalp in others, acted as a premium on wolf growing, and made it more profitable in some parts of Minnesota to raise wolves than sheep, so the complaint is made that "wolf-farming" has become an "industry." It was also discovered that young wolves captured in the three-dollar months were carefully preserved until the five-dollar months came around. So the state law for the extermination of wolves having multiplied their numbers, it is proposed to repeal it altogether. The same experience will follow the indemnification for the loss of wheat by hail, storm, or blight. After a few years, the law having multiplied hailstorms in Minnesota it will be repealed like the bounty on wolves.

* * *

A portentous rumbling was heard last Sunday week in Chicago. It came from that throbbing volcano known as "Organised Labor." There was a debate in the Trades and Labor Assembly over the employment of non-union men by the Directory of the World's Columbian Exposition, the Assembly declaring that none but Union men should be employed, and threatening riot and rebellion should their demands be disregarded and their commands disobeyed. One member sprung to his feet and shouted, "We will make the Directory put a regiment of soldiers around their grounds if they employ scab labor." The meaning of that is plain, "No man outside our society shall be permitted to earn bread for his wife and children by working for the World's Fair. Should he attempt to do so we will prevent him by violence." This is a usurpation of power for the sake of social injustice. Suppose that "Unorganised Labor" should make a similar threat! What right of proscription and punishment has one side more than the other? The threat of the Trades Assembly is a declaration of war, in which they may not have a monopoly of all the persecution. The right of working men to form themselves into Trades Unions is absolutely sacred, and ought to be vindicated at all hazards; the right of workingmen not to join the Unions is equally sacred, and ought to have the same vindication. Our own slavery begins the very moment we attempt to enslave others. No "organised" members, though including all mankind except one man, can acquire the right to deprive that one of his liberty.

* * *

The first eruption of the volcano called "Organised Labor" occurred a few days after the warlike declaration of the Trades Assembly. It was not very fiery or destructive, but there was a promise in it of a shower of cinders heavy enough to bury another Herculaneum. Some Italian laborers employed to dig on the grounds of the World's Fair, were set upon by "Organised Labor," beaten, and driven from their work. The excuse for it all was that those poor men were Italians, or in the language of their assailants, "Dagos," having no right to work for a living in this land. There was a good deal of comic irony in the performance when a lot of organised foreigners declared that in this National and International testimonial to an Italian, no Italian should have part, nor be allowed to work on the tributary buildings to be erected in honor of Columbus. If this kind of petty persecution is to be continued the Italian government will very likely decline to take any part whatever in the Columbian Exposition.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

AGNOSTICISM JUSTIFIED.

To the Editor of The Open Court.—

YOUR article "Questions of Agnosticism" reminds me of several things I have seen in your paper upon the same term and what it is said to mean, and I admit that I write this because I am angry with you for what I have no better expression than your dishonesty in writing about it.

I know something of what the human mind is and I can almost plead guilty to the worship of Matthew Arnold's gentle God of Tendency, and I sometimes rival David in the hope that this God will make haste and do something for human intelligence and intellectual honesty and consistency. But as to Agnosticism, there are three kinds, are there? Is that true? or the statement honest? You know how the term originated and what it was coined to connote.

If I am asked is there a God who created the universe and controls and manages it, I answer I don't know, and you say it is awful.

If asked will men live another life in another world after death in this, how is it pessimistic? I answer the modest truth that I havn't found out. Now these and kindred questions are those to which the term was originally intended to apply and it has always

been so understood and used by all honest writers—so there can be no three kinds of agnostics, either wise or simple, to talk about. Agnosticism simply means intellectual honesty.

Your assumption (and that of Don Piat and certain Catholic priests) that agnosticism is in some way an assumption of knowledge when it professes ignorance is unfounded, unfair and ridiculous.

Grand Rapids, Mich. IRA Y. BURNHAM.

[The preachers of dogmatic religion have often—and not without cause—been declared guilty of stigmatising all who do not believe as they do, as dishonest. There are, however, agnostics who in spite of their opposition to orthodox religion resemble the dogmatist in zealous intolerance and narrow-mindedness as much as one egg resembles another. There is no objection to Mr. Burnham's "I do not know," but there is a great objection to the proposition that no one can know. Concerning Mr. Burnham's assurance "I know something of what the human mind is," we take the liberty of reserving our doubts. ED.]

SHOULD THE WORLD'S FAIR BE OPEN ON SUNDAY?

To the Editor of The Open Court:—

THIS question is, I understand, soon to be decided by a committee of residents of Chicago, and I should like to see it discussed fully in *The Open Court*. I should particularly like to know how much truth there is in the story that the Centennial Exhibition, in 1876 at Philadelphia, though nominally closed against visitors, was really open to any one who chose to pay for being passed in by an exhibitor. Poor people and strangers who had no friends were shut out, while rich Philadelphians made up Sunday parties in order to see the show without being annoyed by vulgar crowds. That is the way Sunday laws generally work; and I don't want to have any such favoritism at the Columbian Exposition. Governor Willey, of Idaho, is right in saying that this Fair should be kept open for the "benefit of the poor people in Chicago: they will find things of more than usual interest in and about the grounds, that will tend to elevate their standard and keep them from the saloons." F. M. HOLLAND.

BOOK REVIEWS.

OUR DESTINY. The Influence of Nationalism on Morals and Religion. An Essay in Ethics. By *Laurence Gronlund*, A.M. Boston: Lee & Shepard.

This book is a revised and enlarged version of a series of articles published in *The Nationalist*. Its author believes that socialism, which is to be inaugurated not by violence, but by enthusiasm, will establish, virtually, the kingdom of heaven on earth, and it will evolve an irresistible belief in God and immortality. Mr. Gronlund says: "I hold that, though it be perhaps a fact that a majority of those who are called Socialists are avowed Atheists, yet Atheism is not an integral part of Socialism, but merely an accretion upon it, like tartar upon the enamel of the teeth. Such are Atheists, not because they are Socialists, but because they are Frenchmen and Germans. Nationalism is eminently religious."

NOTES.

Mr. W. L. Sheldon of St. Louis has published a thoughtful and spirited address on the subject: "How far is it right to make happiness the chief aim of life?" His advice is, "not to go seeking for happiness, for that is just the way to lose what chance there is of finding it," and he bases this rule upon the consideration that "happiness is not the chief aim of life. . . . Joy is the accompaniment and not the aim. If we make it the aim, we lose it even as the accompaniment."

THE OPEN COURT.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:
$2.00 PER YEAR. $1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.
AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND TASMANIA, $2.50 PER YEAR.

All communications should be addressed to
THE OPEN COURT,
(Nixon Building, 175 La Salle Street,)
P. O. DRAWER F. CHICAGO, ILL.

CONTENTS OF NO. 183.